DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 210 IR 051 584

AUTHOR Ming, Marilyn; MacDonald, Gary W.
TITLE A Cooperative Project for the Development and Delivery of Training to Rural Library Staff across Alberta. Phase Two/Three. Second Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Grant MacEwan Community Coll., Edmonton (Alberta).; Southern Alberta Inst. of Technology, Calgary.
SPONS AGENCY Alberta Dept. of Advanced Education, Calgary.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 111p.; For related reports, see ED 257 466 and ED 265 869.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Programs; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Distance Education; Educational Needs; Field Tests; Foreign Countries; Job Training; Library Cooperation; Library Networks; *Library Personnel; Library Statistics; Program Descriptions; Public Libraries; *Rural Areas; School Libraries; Shared Library Resources
IDENTIFIERS *Alberta

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Rural Library Training Project is to design, implement, and evaluate a basic training curriculum for the staff of rural school and public libraries in Alberta. This Phase Two/Three Second Interim Report describes project activities from October 1, 1985 through March 31, 1986. These activities consist of the fall field test of the first three courses, the development of additional courses, and the beginning of the winter field test of the next two courses. This report also includes data about student performance and perceptions from the fall field tests, course delivery cost analysis, projected activities for the balance of Phase Two/Three, and recommendations for a projected Phase Four. Included at the end of this report is the external evaluator's report for the same time period. Appendices include the fall field test data; the student assessment form; the form for those who did not complete courses; cost analysis spreadsheets; the course delivery plan; the revised curriculum; the projected status for courses; and evidence to support a fourth phase. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272210

Phase Two/Three
SECOND INTERIM REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR051584

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jeannette Nicholls

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RURAL LIBRARY training project

A COOPERATIVE PROJECT

for the

DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF TRAINING

to

RURAL LIBRARY STAFF ACROSS ALBERTA

PHASE TWO/THREE

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

Submitted to:
Program Planning and Development Branch
Alberta Advanced Education

Submitted by:
Southern Alberta Institute of Technology
Grant MacEwan Community College

April 1986

The Rural Library Training Project is ...

An innovative project jointly funded by Alberta Advanced Education, Grant MacEwan Community College, and the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.

The members of the Project Management Team are ...

Tony Fell, Program Head, Library Technician, Grant MacEwan Community College.

Gary W. MacDonald, Program Supervisor, Library and Information Technology, Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.

Marilyn Ming, Project Coordinator, Rural Library Training.

Diane Osberg, Director, Continuing Education, Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.

Yvonne Walmsley, Projects Manager Community Education, Grant MacEwan Community College.

The external evaluator is ...

Allen Ponak, Associate Professor, Faculty of Management, University of Calgary.

The members of the Advisory Committee are ...

Martin Adamson, Associate Director, Media and Technology Branch, Alberta Education.

Barbara Clubb, Assistant Director, Library Services, Alberta Culture.

Dr. Doug Crawford, Director, Learning Systems Branch, Alberta Advanced Education.

Laurie Moffat, Rutherford North Library, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Alberta.

Peter Maxwell-Muir, Further Education Services, Alberta Advanced Education.

Dr. Brent Pickard, Director, Program Planning and Development, Alberta Advanced Education.

Nora Robinson, Library, Alberta Vocational Centre.

Wayne Shillington, Director, North Region, Lakeland College.

The Grant MacEwan Community College principals responsible for the project are ...

Paul Byrne, Dean, Communication Arts and Educational Support.

T.C. Day, Vice-President, Academic.

Peggy Quinney, Coordinator, College Outreach and Community Education.

The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology principals responsible for the project are ...

R.W.D. Erhardt, Academic Vice-President.

Jeanette A. Nicholls, Director, Marketing and Learning Support.

Doug V. White, Department Head, Communication Arts.

The logo for the project was designed by ...

Ken Watson, Educational Media Services, Southern Alberta Institute of Technology.

The Rural Library Training Project is located at ...

1301 - 16th Avenue N.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2M 0L4
Telephone 284-8072

Rural Library Training Project

Phase Two/Three
Second Interim Report

Table of Contents

Abstract vii

Project Objectives, Evaluation, and Research 1

Field Test 5

Student Performance and Perceptions of Courses 11

Still a Few Bugs in the System 21

Independent Review of Courses 27

Course Development and Revision 29

Credentialling Issue 33

Cost Analysis 35

Conclusions and Projected Activities 39

Appendix A: Fall Field Test Data A-1

Appendix B: Student Assessment Form B-1

Appendix C: Form for Those Who Do Not Complete Courses C-1

Appendix D: Cost Analysis Spreadsheets D-1

Appendix E: Course Delivery Plan E-1

Appendix F: Revised Curriculum F-1

Appendix G: Projected Status of Courses G-1

Appendix H: Support for Phase Four H-1

External Evaluation of Phase Two/Three Second Interim Report 1

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Rural Library Training Project is to design, implement and evaluate a basic training curriculum for the staff of rural libraries in Alberta. Phase One of the project began on December 1, 1984 and the activities of this phase through March 31, 1985 are described in the **First Phase Report**. The **Phase Two/Three First Interim Report** described the activities from April 1 through September 30, 1985.

This **Phase Two/Three Second Interim Report** describes the activities from October 1, 1985 through March 31, 1986. These activities consist of the fall field test of the first three courses, the development of additional courses, and the beginning of the winter field test of the next two courses. This report also includes data about student performance and perceptions from the fall field tests, course delivery cost analysis, projected activities for the balance of Phase Two/Three, and recommendations for a projected Phase Four. Included at the end of this report is the external evaluator's report for the same time period.

Report prepared by
Marilyn Ming and Gary W. MacDonald

PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH

The Rural Library Training Project is organized into three phases:

Phase One: Planning and Analysis
Phase Two: Development of Instructional Units
Phase Three: Field Testing

The phases are not sequential but were divided in the original proposal in terms of the major activity of the phase. Thus, over the duration of the project the phases continue to overlap.

The objectives and activities of Phase One were reported in the **First Phase Report**, issued in April 1985. It detailed the procedures and results of an extensive needs analysis conducted throughout Alberta, as well as a literature search, discussions with library consultants throughout the province, and a survey of human and material resources. The **Phase Two/Three First Interim Report**, issued in October 1985, described the design of the curriculum, the development of initial courses, and the beginning of the field test of those courses. That report also included data about the students enrolled in the field test and evaluation methods.

Project Objectives, Evaluation, and Research

Specific objectives and progress to date for Phase Two of this project are:

Settle the credentialling issues with major stakeholders and the advisory committee.

Completed. A Rural Library Training Project Basic/Advanced Level Certificate in Small Library Operations will be jointly issued by SAIT's Continuing Education Division and Grant MacEwan's College Outreach and Community Education Services. Two students received basic level certificates in March. See Credentialling Issue section.

Outline a basic curriculum based on survey data and consultant input.

Completed. The curriculum as approved by the Rural Library Training Project Advisory Committee was included in the Phase Two/Three First Interim Report. Some modifications have been made based on field test results. See Course Development and Revision section.

Develop design parameters and write specific objectives for each instructional unit.

In progress. Of the seven courses which have been developed, four have been field tested and are being revised, two are currently being field tested, and one is scheduled to be field tested in the spring. See Course Development and Revision section.

Determine relevant courses already available in the province and review existing relevant material, deciding its potential for modification and use in a distance mode.

Completed. Results were reported in Phase Two/Three First Interim Report.

Contract and orient content experts in development of instructional units.

In progress. See Course Development and Revision section.

Write, edit, and produce courseware, including audio, visual, and graphic support materials, in a form suitable for field testing.

In progress. See Course Development and Revision section.

Develop competency-based course evaluation instruments, including pre-tests and post-tests for each instructional unit.

Completed for those courses already developed. Results of pre- and post-tests are included in the Student Performance and Perceptions of Courses section.

Revise the field-tested courses and begin to develop the balance of the courses.

In progress. Revision is based on input from field test students, independent reviewers, tutors, and instructors. See Course Development and Revision section.

Determine possible cost-effective delivery methods.

In progress. See Cost Analysis section of this report for a review of the delivery costs of the first three courses field tested.

Establish nature of cooperation among other institutions.

In progress. The field test utilizes cooperation of Lakeland College, three school divisions in the Lakeland area, and portions of the provincial teleconference network. See Field Test section.

For Phase Three, the objectives are to:

Select field test sites, considering the mode of instruction, the delivery system, and the availability of adequate numbers of students.

Completed. Three field test sites were selected to test three delivery modes. See Field Test section.

Deliver courses to the sites selected.

In progress. See the Field Test and Still a Few Bugs in the System sections.

Evaluate the effectiveness of the courses delivered using the pre-test and post-test evaluation instruments.

In progress. See Student Performance and Perception of Courses section.

Make recommendations based on the tested modes of instruction and delivery for the establishment of the post-project delivery system and network.

In progress. See the Conclusions and Projected Activities section.

At the end of the project the summative evaluation will measure the project's success at achieving its original objectives by answering the following questions:

1. To what degree have the project's curriculum and instructional units met the training needs of rural library staff and produced a measurable increase in library competence?

2. To what degree has the project designed and developed a delivery system and network that can continue to provide library skills training in a cost effective manner?

In addition, throughout the project three specific areas of research were to be addressed:

1. What is the nature of the training needs common to library staff in rural public and school libraries and what are the demographics of this target group?

   Completed. The results of this research are presented in the **First Phase Report.**

2. What is a cost-effective method of delivering training of this nature to such a thinly distributed population?

   In progress. Preliminary results are presented in the Cost Analysis section.

3. How can the resources of many types of institutions be organized into a delivery network to effectively deliver this training?

   In progress. Limited testing of a multi-institutional delivery network was begun in Phase Two/Three. Testing of a province-wide delivery network is part of the proposal for Phase Four. See Conclusions and Projected Activities section.

FIELD TEST

As described in the Phase Two/Three First Interim Report, three delivery modes were chosen for the field tests:

- on-site instructor with six weekly classes,
- teleconference with six biweekly classes, and
- correspondence with telephone-tutor sessions.

Selection of the test sites was based on several factors. In order to establish a common base of previous exposure to library training in the field test students, the sites chosen should have had minimal access to distance education library courses in the past (*). With three delivery modes, it was necessary to find a site with a widely scattered population, a site with teleconference availability, and a site with enough students geographically close together to warrant an on-site

---

(*) This was desirable for two reasons. Students who had completed SAIT and GMCC library distance education courses could use them for credit in lieu of some of the RLT courses and thus the population available for field testing the RLT courses would be reduced. Previous exposure to library distance education courses theoretically would reduce opportunities to measure attitudinal changes.

instructor. The sites also had to be part of the existing delivery networks that were to be tested. Other factors involved in the selection were the presence or absence of a regional library system, a mixture of school and public libraries, and a mixture of both self-selected students and non-self-selected students (*). In addition, the students participating in the field test should be representative of the target population surveyed in the Phase One research.

The following chart summarizes the characteristics and delivery modes used in the three field test sites. As well, the Phase Two/Three **First Interim Report** comparison of the demographics of the field test students to that of the target population indicated that the field test group was a reasonably representative sample.

(*) A self-selected student is one who voluntarily enrolls in a course. A non-self-selected student is one who is required as a condition of employment to be enrolled in a course.

Bonnyville/St. Paul area:

Mostly (87%) non-self-selected
Mostly school library staff
Developing regional system
Some library technician courses previously available via teleconferencing and on-site instructors
Geographically close population
Teleconference network in place but only being used as backup for on-site instruction
Cooperation with Lakeland college and three school divisions

Delivery mode: on-site instruction

Peace River area:

All self-selected
Mixture of school and public library staff
Developing regional system
Some library technician courses previously available via teleconferencing
Geographically scattered population
Teleconference network in place
Cooperation with Further Education Councils and Peace Cooperative Library Project

Delivery modes: teleconference and correspondence with telephone tutor

---

Crowsnest area:

All self-selected
Mostly public library staff
No regional library system
Geographically scattered population
No library technician courses available in past
Teleconference network in place but not utilized for the field test because none of the students was interested in this delivery mode in this area

Delivery mode: correspondence with telephone tutor.

Field Test

The Fall field test began in the three field test sites in September 1985 and was completed by the end of January 1986. The students in the Bonnyville/St. Paul area met one afternoon a week with an on-site instructor. Initially the class was held in a school library in Bonnyville but was moved to a more spacious classroom on Lakeland College's Fort Kent campus in November. During inclement weather the course was teleconferenced from Vermilion to Cold Lake, St. Paul, and Bonnyville. In the Crowsnest and Peace areas students had a choice of either teleconference or correspondence with a telephone tutor. Teleconference students in six teleconference sites met once every two weeks at 7:45 a.m. while correspondence students arranged the time of their tutor telephone calls on an individual basis with their tutors. As the following chart indicates, the on-site classes were taught every week, while the teleconference and correspondence courses were taught on an alternating week basis to compensate for the vagaries of the postal system.

FALL FIELD TEST

Course	Mode	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan
RLT 11	all modes	x x x	x			
RLT 12	on-site		x x x x	x x x		
	teleconference		x x	x x	x x	x
	correspondence		x x	x x	x x	x
RLT 13	on-site			x	x x x	x x x
	teleconference		x x	x x	x	x x
	correspondence		x x	x x	x	x x

RLT 11, Program Orientation and Study Skills
RLT 12, Introduction to Library Procedures and Terminology
RLT 13, Basic Library Management

In late January 1986 the Winter field test of RLT 14 (Information Services) and RLT 23 (Collection Development) began (*). Correspondence and teleconference students are studying RLT 14 and RLT 23 on alternate weeks while the on-site students will complete RLT 14 before beginning RLT 23. A spring field test of RLT 32 (Microcomputer Applications for Small Libraries) is planned for May 1986.

In addition to these six courses, RLT 39 (Professional Development) was prepared and field tested during the Fall and Winter. The course recognizes the learning value inherent in conference and workshop sessions but also recognizes the lack of purpose experienced by many participants in those sessions. Hence, in RLT 39, students learn to develop objectives for attending conferences and to write a pre-conference proposal suitable for presentation to their library boards or administrators. After attending the conference or workshop they then write a post-conference report summarizing the relevance of the sessions to their own libraries and demonstrating the benefit to the library of their attendance at the conference. Students receive credit based on the number of hours of conference participation and can accumulate up to twenty-four hours for a maximum of two instructional units.

This course was field tested with the cooperation of the Peace Cooperative Library System and Alberta Culture at three conferences in

---

(*) RLT 14 (Information Services) is a required course for the certificates. RLT 23 (Collection Development) is a prerequisite for other library materials courses.

the Fall and Winter. The Peace Cooperative Library System held a three day workshop called Rural Libraries II in October 1985. Before issuing their advertising for the conference the conference organizer asked permission to pilot RLT 39 at this conference. Eleven students who had completed the prerequisite RLT 11 subsequently registered for RLT 39 and after completion of the required assignments, were credited with from seven to fifteen hours of conference participation. RLT 39 was only tested in the correspondence mode due to the individualized nature of the course although there was an initial teleconference session held during the Rural Libraries II Workshop to acquaint the students with requirements and procedures. The course was subsequently tested again at the Alberta Culture Library Services Systems Workshop in November 1985, with most of the students who had participated in the first workshop as well as three new students. The course was revised in January 1986 and offered to pilot students who were attending the Peace Cooperative Library System Rural Libraries Workshop III in March 1986. Because of the nature of the course, pre-tests and post-tests are inappropriate. Informal comments indicate satisfaction with the course and students will complete course evaluation forms in Spring 1986.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND PERCEPTIONS OF COURSES

The statistical analysis on which the discussion in this section is based utilizes three separate sets of data:

- a comprehensive registration form completed by each student at the beginning of the field test (complete data analysis reported in **Phase Two/Three First Interim Report**),
- scores from the students' pre- and post-tests as well as their final grades in each course,
- a course evaluation form (see Appendix B) completed by students at the end of each course, or a dropout form (see Appendix C) completed by students who withdrew from any course.

The data from the test scores, final grades, and course evaluations were first analyzed by developing frequency distributions. A sub-group analysis based on delivery mode was performed using chi-square tests. A further sub-group analysis based on type of library was performed using chi-square tests on the course materials section of the evaluation data where more than 5% of the students responded negatively. A similarly limited sub-group analysis based on the students' self-selected status was performed using chi-square tests on the course materials section and the question related to problems with the home study environment. All

analysis was conducted using Minitab, version 5.1. Results were deemed statistically significant if the probability of error was less than one-twentieth (i.e., $p < .05$).

Appendix A presents the details of the analysis of data gathered in the first three courses field tested. The data includes information from eighty-nine students who completed RLT 11, sixty-four of the sixty-six students in RLT 12, and sixty-nine of the seventy-six students in RLT 13 (*).

1. **How did the students perform on the pre- and post-tests?**

Multiple choice, true/false, and short answer questions were prepared for each module and objective of each course. These questions were stored in a computer managed learning (CML) questionbank. All the questions prepared were printed as review questions at the end of each module in the printed course materials. For the pre- and post-tests a selection of questions was drawn from the CML questionbank according to a test profile which assured that each module objective was tested. Pre- and post-test scores are reported in Table 3.

There was no pre-test for RLT 11 and on the post-test most of the students (77%) achieved over 90%. Only two students earned a grade of less than 80% which was the pass grade for the course. Those students had the opportunity to write a similar exam again and one passed the second time.

Students wrote pre-tests for RLT 12 and 13. Although more than half of the students achieved over 60% on each pre-test, only a few (10% for RLT 12 and 2% for RLT 13) earned over 80% on those pre-tests. The mean pre-test scores for RLT 12 and RLT 13 were 65.8% and 62.7% respectively. These scores are not surprising considering the library experience of the students and the introductory nature of the courses. The original survey data indicated that it had been an average of fifteen years since the students were involved in course study and that many of them were

---

(*) The number of course evaluation forms completed for each course is less than the total enrollees because all the forms had not been received at the time the statistical analyses were performed. One student steadfastly refused to complete any course evaluation forms.

unsure of their ability to deal with a study situation. Therefore it was important that the students increase their self-confidence and that they succeed in these first courses. Credit for a course based on the pre-test alone would not be appropriate since the CML-generated tests are unable to evaluate all the learning objectives, in particular the objectives which deal with the applicability of course material to the student's own situation. A discussion of the future role of pre-tests in included in the Conclusions and Projected Activities section.

Very few (10%) of the students who wrote the pre-test for RLT 12 earned more than 80%, while almost all (98%) of those same students who wrote the post-test after the course earned better than 80%. In RLT 13, the achievement was similar with only one student achieving over 80% on the pre-test and almost all (97%) earning over 80% on the post-test. Similarly the mean increased by about 30 percentage points in both courses (Table 3).

2. What were the students' final grades?

The final grade in the RLT courses is based on a weighted combination of assignment scores and the post-test score. Usually the post-test is worth 30% of the final grade. The RLT courses use SAIT's Library and Information Technology grading scheme to translate weighted scores into letter grades as follows:

Letter Grade	Verbal Description	Weighted Scores
A	Excellent	95.00 & over
A-	Excellent	90.00-94.99
B+	Commendable	86.67-89.99
B	Commendable	83.33-86.66
B-	Commendable	80.00-83.32
C+	Satisfactory	76.67-79.99
C	Satisfactory	73.33-76.66
C-	Satisfactory	70.00-73.32
D+	Minimal Pass	65.00-69.99
D	Minimal Pass	60.00-64.99
F	Failure	59.99 & under

The final grades reflect the overall high achievement attained by the students (Table 5). Only 11% of the students in RLT 12 earned less than a "B" and only 1.5% of the students in RLT 13 earned less than a "B".

3. How did the students assess the course materials?

The students rated the course materials very positively (Table 6). In terms of understandability and explanation of purpose and content, 100% of the students responded positively for all three

courses. In other areas, 90% or more of the students in every course responded positively to questions about the quality of the materials, the logical step-by-step sequence, the currency, appropriateness of assignment content, quality of audio-visual material where used, the exams as measures of achievement, and the applicability and effectiveness of the textbooks where used.

Although just over 10% of the students expressed concern about the comprehensiveness of each course, some students reported that the materials were too comprehensive while others felt they were not comprehensive enough. About one quarter (24%) indicated that the RLT 11 materials were not relevant, whereas only 6% had the same complaint about RLT 12 and 13% with RLT 13. The assignments for RLT 11 and 12 were thought to be too long by 12% and 20% of the students respectively (Table 6). These concerns are being addressed in the revision process.

A sub-group analysis by delivery mode within each course revealed no significant differences (Table 9). An additional sub-group analysis by type of library within each course was performed on the data for logical sequencing, comprehension, relevance, appropriateness of the assignments, etc. where more than 5% of the students had responded negatively. Again, there were no significantly different responses by type of library (Table 12).

A sub-group analysis by self-selected status within each course was performed on the data for course materials where more than 5% of the students had responded negatively (Table 14). Although a somewhat larger percentage of non-self-selected students responded negatively about assignment length (in RLT 11 and RLT 12) and course relevancy/assignment content (in RLT 13), these differences between self-selected and non-self-selected students were not statistically significant.

Typical student comments about the course materials are:

I found the course materials easy to read and understand.

Sometimes it was too general and thus hard to comprehend.

Well organized, quite easy to follow.

The course itself is well thought out and practical--the text is good.

There were quite a few sections where the wording or instructions were not clear.

I found the course very easy to follow and understand.

I am very new as a librarian and have not done much studying for years but RLT11 was excellent and enlightening.

I wish I had this course [RLT 11] 30 years ago.

[Relevancy] For the purpose of relearning how to study--very good. From a library point of view--not very [RLT 11].

Very relevant because I've been out of school for 16 years [RLT 11].

I appreciate the "ground-up" type of training. Concepts presented well.

They seem to leave me hanging in the areas I want to learn more about--too general.

There's hardly a day goes by in my work that I don't use at least one thing I learned in my course.

Some were too technical for our small rural library.

It covered everything necessary for a librarian in a small library.

The assignments dealt with the content in relation to our own library.

The assignment where we collected information about local resources took many hours--but will be very useful. Maybe a longer period of time should be given.

It has been very helpful to me in the management of our library.

Good sequence, many things learned, applicable to daily work.

A lot of information crammed into that little package.

4. **How did the students assess the delivery method?**

Many (47%) of the students in RLT 11 reported problems in receiving their materials on time, but because this course began the first week of September and many registration forms were not received before the mailing deadline, this type of problem was expected. For RLT 12 and 13, only 3% and 4% of the students reported not getting materials on time (Table 7).

A sub-group analysis by delivery mode within each course revealed some significant differences (Table 10). Students reported difficulty with equipment in all three courses, but a significant proportion of those students in each course were in teleconference classes. Similarly a significant proportion of the students reporting difficulty with the postal service were taking their courses via teleconference or correspondence. Not unexpectedly, the correspondence students reported no difficulties with travel whereas the students with an on-site instructor reported the most difficulty. The on-site students also reported more problems than the other groups with their classroom for RLT 11 and 12, but with a change from a school library in Bonnyville to a Lakeland College classroom at Fort Kent for RLT 13, their classroom problems were solved, with only 10% reporting dissatisfaction with the classroom. In teleconference mode a few (5%) students reported dissatisfaction with the classroom because their teleconference centre was located in a room which was used primarily for storing untanned moose hides and had a rather distinctive odor.

Typical student comments about the delivery method are:

When is the Canadian postal system not a problem?

I was late receiving material but only because I was late registering.

My materials arrived almost two weeks late and this made it very difficult because of the time pressures resulting.

We were cut-off once before the end of class. We were unable to get on the bridge during another class.

There were problems each week--cut off too soon, not joined up soon enough. Very frustrating! [teleconference]

Missed one class because of slippery roads. Phoned instructor and was relayed pertinent information.

Found it a bit confusing to be working on RLT12 one week and RLT13 the next. Would rather have done all of one, then the other.

Since the move to Fort Kent things have greatly improved.

I thoroughly enjoyed the morning classes, eliminated wasted time after school. May feel differently in mid-winter.

Too early in the morning.

No real problem, although we went away smelling like smoked moose hide!!

Fire practice--could have done without.

Weather! But weather is usually a problem in the winter for rural Northern Alberta.

I travel 203 km, return, to and from this course.

5. **Did the students have any problems studying at home?**

Approximately one-half of the students in every course reported problems with creating study environments at home (Table 7). However, there was no statistically significant difference based on delivery mode (Table 10).

A sub-group analysis by self-selected status within each course revealed significant differences (Table 15). Approximately three-quarters of the non-self-selected students in RLT 12 and RLT 13 reported problems with the home study environment while less than half of the self-selected students reported problems. See the Still a Few Bugs in the System section for a discussion of this result.

Typical student comments about home study environment are:

Found I had to wait until late in the evening.

There are 3 adults and 3 children living in our home which is not extremely large.

We manage apartments, so there was the collecting of rent, cleaning apartments, working at school all day, cleaning at night and trying to spend time with my family. It's very hectic.

November being a busy month for school libraries and December being an exceptionally busy month for everyone.

Just before Christmas was difficult--the break was sure welcome.

Having been working full time since the beginning of December, I sometimes found the evenings with 4 children a bit noisy.

6. How did the students assess their instructors or tutors?

Instructors and tutors were evaluated on their knowledge, preparation, and availability to help, explain, and motivate (Table 8). There were no statistically significant differences among the six instructors/tutors (Table 11). The correspondence tutors were overwhelmingly reported as successful with some comments describing them in glowing terms. The same held true for the on-site instructor with only 15% of RLT 12 students dissatisfied with the promptness of assignment return. The teleconference instructors also fared well, although two of them were reported to be difficult to reach by 20% of the students. No one reported that any instructors were unwilling or unable to help.

Typical student comments about the instructors/tutors are:

She made me feel I could do it and not give up like I had planned (at times).

Very friendly and willing to help always.

She was available when I needed to talk to her. She was good natured and understandable. She was very helpful with things I didn't understand.

Friendly, positive, willing to work, practical, sensible.

Warm, friendly personality comes through when teleconferencing. Concern about the students and course materials is very evident.

Courteous, cheerful, understanding, helpful, alert, punctual, dedicated.

Could explain points in question very well over the telephone. Was most willing to give you any assistance at any time. I found the instructor most informative.

She made me feel at ease immediately. There was never any fear of asking her anything. I really enjoyed having her as a tutor.

Great personality, really understanding, realizes that we are all working plus families to look after and understands the problems that do crop up.

Explains well and is flexible, seems to have a varied

background to draw upon.

7. Why did students drop out of the courses?

Of the students who dropped out of a course or the field test, several dropped back in, and two students are auditing courses. Fifteen students are not currently registered in any of the RLT courses. The eleven students who returned the drop-out form indicated that very few dropped out because of problems with the courses, but instead did so because of personal reasons (Table 16). Most (80%) reported that they would probably take RLT courses again (Table 17).

In summary, most students did very well in the courses and found the course materials and instructors effective. Because there were so few negative comments, it was difficult to perform meaningful sub-group analyses. A few statistically significant differences emerged by delivery modes. One statistically significant difference emerged by self-selected status. The overall positive assessments reinforce the belief that the curriculum and each course fit the needs and abilities of the target groups for whom they were intended.

STILL A FEW BUGS IN THE SYSTEM

The purpose of this section is to collate a variety of informal observations based on the first field tests. These observations are not immediately evident in the vast amount of formal data that was collected.

The on-site instructor method of delivery used in the Bonnyville/St. Paul area demonstrated that the task of matching an on-site class with an on-site instructor is not an easy one. First, there must be a large enough group of students. The preliminary cost analysis suggests that at least twenty students must be in a class to make this method economically feasible. Second, qualified and available instructors in remote areas are difficult to locate. This is made doubly difficult since on-site classes sponsored by employers will most likely meet during work hours--the time when most qualified instructors will already be working. In the Bonnyville/St. Paul area there were no local qualified instructors available; however, a qualified instructor who lived in Vermilion and worked only part-time was willing to drive

the 110 km each way from Vermilion to Bonnyville and then to Fort Kent to teach this course. The preliminary cost analysis suggests that given sufficient class enrollment, the travel expenses of an on-site instructor do not make this a more expensive delivery mode than teleconference or correspondence. However, class enrollment and availability of an instructor must be confirmed whenever a sponsoring institution wishes to offer on-site classes.

The Fall field tests demonstrated that there were no statistically significant differences in perception of course materials between self-selected and non-self-selected students. There were expected differences in delivery mode which could be attributed to the on-site situation rather than the self-selected status and one outstanding significant difference in the ability of the students to create a satisfactory home study environment. Most of the students with the on-site instructor were non-self-selected since participation in the field test was required by their school superintendents. Although these students were granted paid release time for travel and class attendance, the time required for class preparation and assignments was their own time. The data supported the informal comments made to the instructor and project coordinator which indicated that at least some of the students resented this unanticipated commitment of their time. On the course evaluation forms for RLT 12 43% of the self-selected students reported problems with their home study environment while 73% of the non-self-selected students had problems studying at home. For RLT 13, 45% of the self-selected students reported problems while 76% of the non-self-selected students had problems. The data and the informal

observations suggest that the non-self-selected students require adequate advance notice of this committment of their time, as well as convincing evidence that these courses are a worthwhile use of their time.

The necessity of clearly establishing responsibilities and information requirements in a multi-institutional delivery network was demonstrated in the on-site instructor delivery mode. In the Bonnyville/St. Paul field test, there were four institutions or groups of institutions involved:

- Three school districts (sponsors):
  - o County of St. Paul #19,
  - o Lakeland School District #5460,
  - o Lakeland RCSSD #150
- Lakeland College (local facilitator)
- SAIT Continuing Education Division (delivery)
- Rural Library Training Project (content and instruction)

Most of the responsibilities were well defined before the field test began (*); however, no regular system of communication was established among the institutions to monitor the progress of the courses. The institutions communicated with each other mostly in response to crises.

(*) For example, Lakeland College was responsible for publicity, collection of registration forms and fees, distribution of materials, and provision of classroom and necessary equipment. SAIT's Continuing Education Division contracted for the instructor and was responsible for class lists, receipt of registration fees, and coordination with Lakeland College for materials distribution. The RLT project coordinator was responsible for instructor selection, orientation, support and supervision.

Still a Few Bugs in the System

The field test demonstrated the need for the local facilitator to serve as a clearinghouse for student problems by either resolving them or redirecting them to the appropriate institution. Although the responsibility of the sponsoring institutions was to nominate and finance students, at least one of the school boards required attendance records, student course requirements for budgeting purposes, and summaries of the student course evaluations.

In spite of these communication problems, the school superintendents who sponsored their students were pleased with the curriculum and the project as a whole. Some of their comments were:

> They [library staff] have a whole different outlook on themselves. They feel that they have a more clearly defined role that is manageable and can encourage the staff members' [teachers'] involvement in the library program. They are able to articulate to the staff and principal their own roles and those of the teachers in the library program.
>
> They [library staff] like the way the courses are "morselled out" in small manageable pieces. They can see the end of the course at the beginning. At the beginning [of the project], the courses scared them because they had been away from studying for so long.
>
> The biggest complaint was that some of the assignments were too tedious and picky. The courses need more built-in activities and problem-solving sessions for on-site classes.
>
> They like being able to meet other librarians and to exchange information. (*)

Not unexpectedly the teleconference students had the most trouble

---

(*) These comments were made on March 22, 1986 during a meeting held in St. Paul with Marilyn Ming (Coordinator, Rural Library Training Project), Wayne Shillington (Regional Dean, Lakeland College), Ed Nicholson (Assistant School Superintendent, Lakeland School District #5460), and Henri Lemire (Assistant School Superintendent, Lakeland RCSSD #150).

with equipment. These problems included noisy telephone lines, intermittent transmission, and malfunctioning convenors. In the first course some of these problems were caused by the inexperience of the students and the local technical assistants. Since only time can solve this inexperience, the first class with a new group of teleconference students should be primarily designed to help students become comfortable with the techniques and technology of teleconferencing.

The postal system also caused some expected problems since the turn-around time for mailed assignments was at least two weeks. Based on the previous experiences of SAIT's Library and Information Technology program in distance education, an alternating week schedule was adopted for correspondence and teleconference students. Although the students reported that they did not like working on two courses simultaneously, they generally recognized the necessity of receiving an assignment back before they needed to submit the next assignment. Use of the provincial government courier system by some students decreased the turnaround time for assignments but not reliably to one week since courier service to rural areas is not daily. A solution to this problem will probably depend upon the wide-spread use of electronic mail.

The publicity for the field test and the first course RLT 11 (Program Orientation and Study Skills) optimistically advised students that they would spend no more than six hours per week preparing for class, attending a class, and completing assignments. Many students reported that they spent much more time than that on the courses. The six hour estimate did not take into account the varying reading speeds

and study skills of the students. The time estimate will be revised to read "approximately the time you would spend studying for one academic night class per week."

The weekly telephone meeting of tutors, instructors, course author, and project coordinator to discuss the week's module proved to be a valuable use of time. Instructors/tutors were able to clarify points with the course author, agree on what activities should be highlighted that week, and identify potential problems with the course materials. In most cases the teleconference instructor was also the course author and so was receiving first hand feedback as to the usefullness and clarity of her materials. Thus some of the bugs in the course materials were resolved before the week's classes or telephone sessions. In addition, tutors and instructors with varying levels of teaching experience could share ideas on how to review the week's module. A final meeting was held at the end of each course to review the course as a whole in order to identify aspects such as sequencing of modules, the relative length of modules and assignments, and the overall perception of course delivery and student performance.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF COURSES

Feedback on the quality of the course materials was obtained from independent reviewers who were neither students, course authors, or instructors in the Rural Library Training Project. Three of the reviewers are from outside the field test areas and have had extensive experience in rural libraries but no formal library training. The other reviewers are library consultants.

The general responses from all the reviewers have been extremely positive. The negative comments generally addressed typographical or mechanical errors although some reviewers did identify a few inaccuracies in the content. The reviewers suggested additional examples, revised statements of policy, and different points of view on subjective issues. These suggestions were made available to instructors and tutors for use in class and telephone sessions. All will be considered during the course revision process. Some of the reviewers comments are:

> [Basic Library Management] covers the essentials of basic management necessary to the running of a public library funded by public money, practical assignments, content, questions and assignments are straight forward and free of "jargon"...modules 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 should be available for small rural library trustees as well as the director.
>
> Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Rural Library Training Project Information Services course. What an excellent piece of work! Interesting, clearly stated, and dear to my heart, the differences between school and public library services are highlighted. [Specific suggestions follow: the price of a recommended book, a title correction, and a recommendation for inclusion of a section from **Focus on Learning**.]
>
> Generally the course [Collection Development] is well done and comprehensive enough to apply the fundamental considerations related to library collection development...the work presupposes the existence of resources in the library which were selected and weeded in some fashion.
>
> In spite of minor typing errors, I feel that the document [Collection Development] is very competently done and extremely well thought out. [Specific suggestions follow: sentence phrasing corrections, need to emphasize school programs for needs assessment, administrator title correction, need to include non-print materials.]
>
> Librarians have to be particularly aware that their whole collection is a reference/information resource.

The reviewers are:

Barbara Clubb, Assistant Director, Library Services, Alberta Culture.

Pat Crosby, Librarian, Vulcan Public Library

Blanche Friderichson, Consultant, Alberta Education.

Olga Gil, Consultant, Library Services, Alberta Culture

Caroline Graham, Chairman, Vulcan Public Library Board

Frank Karas, Media Consultant, Calgary Board of Education

Gerry Sandy, Retired, Founder of the Lomond Public Library

COURSE DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION

Course revision is based on the following sources:

- course evaluation forms,
- informal comments made by students during class or telephone sessions,
- instructor and tutor comments made during weekly telephone meetings and final course review meetings,
- independent reviewers.

Several problems were identified with the courses RLT 11 (Program Orientation) and RLT 12 (Introduction to Library Procedures and Terminology):

1. One-quarter of the students did not perceive RLT 11 as relevant to their needs.
2. The study skills section of RLT 11 was too detailed and did not specifically address the study skills necessary for RLT courses.
3. Some modules in RLT 12 overlapped each other or duplicated content which will be presented in other courses.
4. RLT 11 is difficult to schedule in an on-going delivery system because of its non-standard length.

The solution to these problems is to combine RLT 11 and 12 into a new course Introduction to Library Training. The new combined course will have two versions. RLT 10 is the full version which includes program orientation, study skills, library terminology, and library procedures. Students who have completed SAIT's Introduction to Libraries (LIT 120) may enroll in the shorter RLT 9 which includes only the program orientation and study skills modules. Both RLT 9 in combination with SAIT's LIT120 and RLT 10 are worth two instructional units.

Since both RLT 11 and RLT 12 were required courses for the Certificate in Small Library Operations, adjustments were necessary in the requirements for the basic and advanced level certificates. See the Revised Curriculum in Appendix F.

The revisions for RLT 13 (Basic Library Management) will include expanded discussion of budgeting and of working with volunteers.

Both RLT 9/10 and RLT 13 will be enhanced during the revision process by additional graphics.

Although the first three courses were entirely print-based, the second set of courses incorporate videotape segments which illustrate particularly appropriate sections. In particular, RLT 14 (Information Services) has a videotape segment on the reference interview, RLT 23 (Collection Development) has a videotape segment on weeding, and RLT 32 (Microcomputer Applications for Small Libraries) has a videotape segment on input and output devices for microcomputers.

Additional courses are under development. The authors of these courses and their qualifications are:

Sue Dutton, B.Ed.; President of Paper Chase Consultants Ltd, with experience in instructional design and delivery and in development of job training programs (RLT 27, Acquisitions)

Karen Lebuik, Branch Supervisor for Wapiti Regional Library, with responsibility for twenty-four branch libraries; co-founder of Impact Communications, a library public relations firm (RLT 22, Library Marketing).

Jean Luthy, B.L.S.; Librarian, Canmore Public Library; former head of children's services, branch head, and area librarian with the Calgary Public Library (RLT 23, Collection Development).

Audrey Mark, M.L.S.; Coordinator of Technical Services, Marigold Library System; former instructor, Cambrian College Library Technician Program (RLT 27, Acquisitions).

Linda Morel, M.L.S.; Instructor, Library and Information Technology Program, SAIT; former school librarian, university librarian (RLT 24, Collection Development, Reader's Guidance, and Programming for Children)

Sheila Newel, Professional Diploma in Education, B.A.; Senior Instructor, English Section, Communication Arts Department, SAIT; former technical writer, computer liaison technologist, experience in curriculum development and course design (RLT 21, Communications).

The projected status of courses developed, field tested and revised as of the end of Phase Two/Three is summarized in Appendix G.

CREDENTIALLING ISSUE

The **Phase Two/Three First Interim Report** concluded that issuance of a Certificate in Small Library Operations for completion of the Rural Library Training Project curriculum would be an appropriate recognition of achievement. However, the question of the implication of a third level library education certificate and the question of the issuing body were not resolved in that report.

The original project proposal suggested that the following stakeholders should be questionned in regard to the credentialling issue: Library Association of Alberta, Alberta Association of Library Technicians, Alberta Library Trustees Association, Learning Resources Council of the Alberta Teachers Association, Library Services Branch of Alberta Culture, Alberta Education, instructional staff and advisory committees of SAIT Library and Information Technology and GMCC Library Technician Diploma Programs, and the University of Alberta Faculty of Library Science. The four stakeholder groups which are not represented on the Rural Library Training Project advisory committee (Alberta

Association of Library Technicians, Alberta Library Trustees Association, Learning Resources Council, and the Faculty of Library Science) were sent an earlier version of the proposed curriculum with a request for official comment. Only the Faculty of Library Science from the University of Alberta failed to respond. The response from the Learning Resources Council was discussed in the **Phase Two/Three First Interim Report** and their concerns were resolved in a restatement of objectives for school library personnel in the curriculum. The Alberta Association of Library Technicians approved the proposed curriculum and unanimously passed a motion to support the project. The Alberta Library Trustees Association also approved the curriculum commenting that it was a useful curriculum not only for rural library staff but for the staff of all small libraries.

After considering the input from the stakeholder groups, SAIT's Continuing Education Department and GMCC's College Outreach and Community Education Services agreed to jointly issue a Rural Library Training Project Basic/Advanced Level certificate in Small Library Operations.

Two students completed requirements for the basic level certificate in March 1986 and were presented with their certificates by the Alberta Minister of Culture. These students were able to complete the requirements while the project is still in its field test phase because they had previously completed several SAIT and GMCC distance education library technician courses

COST ANALYSIS

The data on which the analysis in this section is based is contained in Appendix D. The appendix contains cost figures for RLT 11, RLT 12, and RLT 13 arranged by delivery modes. The cost factors tracked related directly to the actual delivery of specific courses and included fixed costs (which do not vary with the number of students) and variable costs (which do vary with number of students). Some cost factors were fixed for all delivery modes, some variable for all delivery modes, and some dependent on delivery mode. The cost factors tracked for this study were:

1. telephone from tutors to students and students to tutors,
2. postage/packing of course materials and returned assignments,
3. instructor/tutor wages,
4. course materials reproduction,
5. incidental instructor/tutor photocopying,
6. SAIT Continuing Education administration (registration and shipping materials),

7. RLT administration (instructor supervision and record keeping),
8. instructor travel,
9. supervisor telephone to tutors and instructors,
10. teleconference bridge charges,
11. teleconference sites (room and local technical assistant wages).

The costs for RLT 11 cannot be easily compared to those for RLT 12 and RLT 13 because RLT 11 was only half the length of the other courses and incorporates non-recurring start-up costs such as instructor/tutor orientation and support. In addition the postage and packing charges were equivalent to those for a longer course since the mailing of the course package and exams are not dependent upon the length of the course. Tutor telephone costs were also proportionally higher since the tutors needed to establish a rapport with each student.

The data for RLT 12 and RLT 13 are more useful for making comparisons across delivery modes.

Since some of the costs are dependent upon the number of students enrolled, the actual cost factors for each delivery mode were used to project a cost per student based on the number of students in each mode being held constant. The following table projects the delivery for thirty students in each delivery mode:

Projected Delivery Costs for Thirty Students			
	Correspondence	Teleconference	On-site
RLT 12	$87	$83	$70
RLT 13	$91	$84	$67

Although thirty students is a reasonable maximum size for an on-site class, teleconference classes can easily handle larger numbers of students. For sixty teleconference students in eighteen sites the projected cost per student becomes about $73 which is comparable to the on-site delivery cost for thirty students.

In correspondence mode all the costs are variable so altering the number of students will not change the cost per student. However, one of the cost factors for correspondence mode which can be manipulated is the telephone costs. These can be altered either by obtaining cheaper telephone service or by reducing the number of telephone tutor sessions. The use of wide-area-telephone-services (WATS) would not reduce the telephone charges since WATS is most cost-effective during prime business hours (8 AM-6 PM) and many of the telephone sessions were held during the cheaper evening rate period (after 6 PM) (*). Therefore, during the Winter field tests tutors will reduce the number of telephone

---

(*) Other telephone arrangements using conference calls or Alberta government lines such as the FX and RITE lines have been suggested. In the case of the FX and RITE lines the use of these lines is reserved for teleconference instruction, and in the case of the RITE lines can only be used after 4:30 PM. Conference calls do not reduce charges either, since the originating party pays person-to-person rates for each connection.

calls by one-third which should make the correspondence cost per student comparable to the teleconference delivery costs for thirty students. In a province-wide delivery network these telephone charges could also be reduced by the use of local tutors who live closer to their students.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROJECTED ACTIVITIES

The conclusions summarized in this section are based on the Fall 1985 field test and address projected activities for the Winter/Spring field test as well as for a proposed Phase Four which would begin in September 1986.

Telephone tutor sessions:

With the exception of the first introductory course, the tutors will reduce the number of calls made to students by one-third.

Weekly instructor meetings:

Due to the success of the weekly meetings, tutors, instructors, authors, and project coordinator will continue to meet via telephone to discuss and coordinate the week's activities.

Conclusions and Projected Activities

Courses on alternate week schedule:

Until a method of reducing assignment turnaround to one week is found, correspondence and teleconference courses will continue to be scheduled on alternate weeks.

Pre-tests:

After the field test phase, the continued use of pre-tests should be evaluated. Students felt the pre-tests were intimidating and unnecessary. One alternative would be to expand the pre-test into an instrument to be used for evaluation of previous learning for course credit.

Computer managed learning (CML):

Since the pre-test, post-test, and review questions are in a computer managed learning questionbank, the possibility of on-line access for students to these questionbanks will continue to be investigated. The questions to be addressed include of interfacing software, available hardware, and telecommunication costs.

Multi-institutional cooperation:

The responsibilities of the various organizations involved in a multi-institutional delivery network need to be codified. A preliminary checklist based on the experiences of the Fall field test will be developed as a first step toward the establishment of on-going

procedures for cooperating with other institutions in course delivery.

Phase Four:

Because of the success of the project so far and the support expressed both provincially and extraprovincially (see Appendix H), Phase Four of the project should begin in the Fall of 1986 to complete course development for the curriculum, complete pilot testing of the courses, and test province-wide delivery of the Rural Library Training curriculum. Appendix G summarizes course development, revision, and field testing that will occur in Phase Four (*).

Testing of province-wide delivery network:

Two research questions posed in the original **Innovative Project Proposal** (April 1984) would be addressed by the testing of a province-wide delivery network:

1. To what degree have the project's curriculum and instructional units met the training needs of rural library staff and produced a measurable increase in library competence?

2. To what degree has the project designed and developed a delivery system and network that can continue to provide library skills training in a cost effective manner?

In the proposed Phase Four, eight courses would be delivered: RLT 9/10

(*) The details of Phase Four are described in **Phase Four: Proposed Extension of Project** issued in December 1985. The proposal describes the limitations listed in the original proposal, the proposed activities for a Phase Four, and evidence of need for full development of the project. Evaluation methods and a proposed budget are also included.

(offered in Fall and in Winter), RLT 13, RLT 14, RLT 23, RLT 24, RLT 28, and RLT 32. These eight courses would comprise the first two semesters of a proposed six semester cycle of courses. (The tentative course delivery plan is included as Appendix E.) Delivering courses province-wide would also allow for the testing of a variety of cooperative arrangements with other institutions.

Because the three methods used in the Fall field test proved successful and about equally cost-effective, province-wide delivery will employ these same methods: correspondence with a telephone tutor, teleconference, and on-site instruction where there is a sponsoring institution. In the correspondence mode tutors will reduce the tutor/student contact to four sessions instead of six, but maintained at six sessions for the introductory course.

Course fees will be increased to $50 per course from the pilot fee of $36 in order to recover more of the direct cost.

The Phase Four province-wide delivery will test a delivery system which will be as cost-recovery as possible and be integrated within SAIT's existing organizational structure and budgets. Notwithstanding this goal of a cost-recovery delivery system, sources for outside funding will continue to be pursued in order to subsidize the cost of courses either directly to the students or to the delivering institutions.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Fall Field Test Data

Appendix B: Student Assessment Form

Appendix C: Form for Those Who Do Not Complete Courses

Appendix D: Cost Analysis Spreadsheets

Appendix E: Course Delivery Plan

Appendix F: Revised Curriculum

Appendix G: Projected Status of Courses

Appendix H: Support for Phase Four

APPENDIX A
FALL FIELD TEST DATA

Table 1 COURSE ENROLLMENT DATA

Table 2 DELIVERY MODE

Table 3 PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES

Table 4 NUMBER OF TIMES ATTEMPTED POST-TEST

Table 5 FINAL COURSE GRADE

Table 6 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS

Table 7 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DELIVERY MODES

Table 8 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTOR/TUTOR

Table 9 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY DELIVERY MODE AND COURSE

Table 10 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DELIVERY BY DELIVERY MODE AND COURSE

Table 11 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTOR/TUTOR BY DELIVERY MODE AND COURSE

Table 12 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY TYPE OF LIBRARY WITHIN EACH COURSE

Table 13 NUMBERS OF SELF-SELECTED AND NON-SELF-SELECTED STUDENTS

Table 14 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY TYPE OF STUDENT WITHIN EACH COURSE

Table 15 PROBLEMS WITH HOME STUDY ENVIRONMENT BY TYPE OF STUDENT WITHIN EACH COURSE

Appendix A: Fall Field Test Data

Table 16 REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT OF PROGRAM

Table 17 EDUCATIONAL PLANS OF DROPOUTS

Table 1

COURSE ENROLLMENT DATA (*)

Course	Number of Students
RLT 11	89
RLT 12	64
RLT 13	69

* At date analysis undertaken, complete information for RLT 12 and 13 was not available. Actual enrollment in RLT 12 was 66 and RLT 13 was 76.

Table 2

DELIVERY MODE

	Number of Students (*)		
Course	Correspondence	Teleconference	On-site
RLT 11	39	20	30
RLT 12	29	14	21
RLT 13	29	18	22
	Enrollment for Each Mode		
Number	97	52	73
Percentage	43.7	23.4	32.9

* Based on records available at time of analysis

Table 3

PRE- AND POST-TEST SCORES

Score	Percentage of Students				
	RLT 11	RLT 12		RLT 13	
	Post (*) (N=88)	Pre (N=61)	Post (N=62)	Pre (N=63)	Post (N=63)
Less than 50%	0	6.6	0	4.8	0
51-60%	0	23.0	0	30.2	0
61-70%	1.1	39.3	0	54.0	0
71-80%	2.3	21.3	1.6	9.5	3.2
81-90%	19.3	9.8	29.0	1.6	19.1
Over 90%	77.3	0	69.4	0	77.8
	Average Scores in Percent				
Mean	94.0	65.8	92.0	62.7	93.4
Mode	96.0	62.0	95.0	65.0	96.0
Median	96.0	66.0	93.0	63.0	94.0

* No pre-test for RLT 11

Table 4

NUMBER OF TIMES ATTEMPTED POST-TEST

Times	Percentage of Students		
	RLT 11 (N=89)	RLT 12 (N=63)	RLT 13 (N=66)
Once	96.6	100	100
More than once	3.4	0	0

Table 5

FINAL COURSE GRADE

Grade	Percentage of Students		
	RLT 11 (N=89)	RLT 12 (N=64)	RLT 13 (N=69)
A	--	34.4	40.6
A-	--	39.1	40.6
B+	--	9.4	5.8
B	--	3.1	1.5
B-	--	9.4	1.5
Less than B-	--	1.6	0
Pass	98.9	--	--
Incomplete	1.1	3.1	10.1

Table 6

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses		
	RLT 11	RLT 12	RLT 13
Overall rating	3.5	0	1.5
Understandability	0	0	0
Quality of the printing	0	3.2	0
Receive materials on time	47.1	3.2	4.4
Purpose/content well explained	0	0	0
Presented in logical step by step sequence	5.8	4.8	1.5
Up-to-date	0	0	1.5
Too comprehensive	10.5	3.3	3.0
Not comprehensive enough	1.2	6.6	7.5
Relevant to student	24.4	6.4	13.4
Assignments appropriate in content	7.0	4.8	4.6
Assignments appropriate in length	11.6	19.4	2.9
Assignments interesting	14.9	1.6	1.5
Clear information about assignments, weights, and due dates	17.4	11.1	4.4
Quality of audio-visuals	4.8	1.8	1.7
Accessability of a.v. equipment	3.6	1.9	0
Test measured achievement well	0	1.7	1.6
Effectiveness and applicability of textbook (if used)	2.4	not used	not used

N varied from 54 to 87 for RLT 11, 46 to 61 for RLT 12, and 51 to 69 for RLT13 with the exception of the questions on audio-visual materials which were only used in the on-site mode.

Table 7

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DELIVERY MODES

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses RLT 11	RLT 12	RLT 13
Difficulty with equipment	25.0	12.7	14.3
Use of postal system	39.7	23.6	26.6
Problems with travel	9.0	12.5	23.6
Problems with time of class or with time of tutor calls	11.9	8.5	6.3
Problems with classroom	13.9	15.6	7.6
Problems with home study environment	48.8	54.0	54.4

N varied from 58 to 61 for RLT 11, 39 to 49 for RLT 12, and 41 to 49 for RLT13

Table 8

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTOR/TUTOR

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses RLT 11	RLT 12	RLT 13
Knowledge	0	0	0
Preparation for class	1.2	6.6	0
Availability to help	1.4	3.5	3.4
Promptness of assignment return	4.6	7.9	9.1
Ability to explain points	0	0	0
Ability to motivate	1.2	3.4	1.5

N varied from 57 to 68 for RLT 11, 45 to 49 for RLT 12, and 45 to 50 for RLT13

Table 9

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY DELIVERY MODE WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses								
	RLT 11			RLT 12			RLT 13		
	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s
Overall rating	5.3	0	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	4.6
Understandability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of the printing	0	0	0	0	7.1	5.0	0	0	0
Receive materials on time	56.8	42.1	37.9	6.9	0	0	7.1	0	4.6
Purpose/content well explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Presented in logical step by step sequence	5.3	5.0	7.1	3.5	0	10.0	0	0	4.6
Up-to-date	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.6
Too comprehensive	15.8	5.0	7.1	0	0	10.5	3.6	5.6	0
Not comprehensive enough	0	0	3.6	7.1	0	10.5	3.6	11.1	9.5
Relevant to student	29.7	15.0	24.1	6.9	7.1	5.0	3.6	17.7	22.7
Assignments appropriate in content	13.2	0	3.6	3.5	7.7	5.0	0	0	14.3
Assignments appropriate in length	2.6	15.0	21.4	10.3	7.1	42.0	3.5	0	4.6
Assignments interesting	21.1	5.0	13.8	3.5	0	0	0	0	4.6
Clear information about assignments, weights, and due dates	18.4	0	28.6	6.9	7.1	20.0	3.5	0	9.1
Quality of audio-visuals	not used		10.7	not used		6.2	not used		4.5
Accessability of a.v. equipment	not used		3.6	not used		0	not used		0
Test measured achievement well	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	0	6.7	0
Effectiveness and applicability of textbook (if used)	2.9	5.0	0	no textbook used			no textbook used		

(See next page for Notes to Table 9)

Notes to Table 9

crs = correspondence, telec = teleconference, on-s = on-site
N varied from 54 to 87 for RLT 11, 46 to 61 for RLT 12, and 51 to 69 for RLT 13 with the exception of the questions on audio-visual materials which were only used in the on-site mode.
Chi-square test was used across delivery mode within each course. In no cases were differences significant beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 2 d.f.

Table 10

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF DELIVERY BY DELIVERY MODE WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses								
	RLT 11			RLT 12			RLT 13		
	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s
Difficulty with equipment	2.9	70.0*	18.2	0	50.0	0	0	44.4	4.8
Use of postal system	43.2	60.0*	6.3	17.2	35.7	25.0	22.2	33.3	26.3
Problems with travel	NA	0	23.1	NA	21.4	15.0	NA	16.7	45.5*
Problems with time of class or with time of tutor calls	7.9	15.0	15.4	8.0	14.3	5.0	4.0	17.7	0
Problems with classroom	NA	5.0	29.6	NA	0	36.8	7.1	5.6	9.5
Problems with study environment	39.5	55.0	57.1	48.3	57.1	60.0	39.3	61.1	68.2

crs = correspondence, telec = teleconference, on-s = on-site
N varied from 58 to 61 for RLT 11, 39 to 49 for RLT 12, and 41 to 49 for RLT13
Chi-square test was used across delivery mode within each course.
* Statistically significant difference beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 2 d.f.

Appendix A: Fall Field Test Data

Table 11

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTOR/TUTOR BY DELIVERY MODE WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses								
	RLT 11			RLT 12			RLT 13		
	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s	crs	telec	on-s
Knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation for class	0	0	3.6	0	21.4	5.0	0	0	0
Availability to help	2.9	0	0	0	20.0	0	0	20.0	0
Promptness of assignment return	6.5	16.7	0	0	14.3	15.0	3.6	16.7	10.0
Ability to explain points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ability to motivate	0	0	3.5	0	14.3	0	0	5.6	0

crs = correspondence, telec = teleconference, on-s = on-site
N varied from 57 to 68 for RLT 11, 45 to 49 for RLT 12, and 45 to 50 for RLT 13
Chi-square test was used across delivery mode within each course. In no cases were differences significant beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 2 d.f.

Table 12

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY TYPE OF LIBRARY WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses					
	RLT 11		RLT 12		RLT 13	
	public	school	public	school	public	school
Receive materials on time	51.7	47.4	8.3	0	4.8	3.2
Presented in logical step by step sequence	10.0	2.6	8.3	4.2	0	0
Too comprehensive	16.7	7.7	0	4.2	4.8	3.2
Not comprehensive enough	3.3	0	4.3	12.5	9.5	9.7
Relevant to student	34.5	20.5	4.2	4.0	4.8	12.9
Assignments appropriate in content	13.3	2.6	0	8.3	0	6.7
Assignments appropriate in length	6.7	7.9	8.3	29.2	0	3.2
Assignments interesting	23.3	10.3	0	4.0	0	0
Clear information about assignments, weights, and due dates	20.0	18.4	12.5	8.0	0	6.4

Only those questions to which at least 5% of the students responded negatively (as reported in Table 6) are reported in this table.
N varied from 54 to 87 for RLT 11, 46 to 61 for RLT 12, and 51 to 69 for RLT13.
In no cases were differences significant beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 1 d.f.

Table 13

NUMBERS OF SELF-SELECTED AND NON-SELF-SELECTED STUDENTS

Course	Number of Students Self-selected	Non-self-selected (*)
RLT 11	54	22
RLT 12	40	15
RLT 13	43	17

* A self-selected student is one who voluntarily enrolls in a course. A non-self-selected student is one who is required as a condition of employment to be enrolled in a course.

Table 14

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS BY TYPE OF STUDENT WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses					
	RLT 11		RLT 12		RLT 13	
	self	non-self	self	non-self	self	non-self
Receive materials on time	51.2	31.8	5.0	0	4.8	5.9
Presented in logical step by step sequence	9.3	0	5.1	6.7	0	5.8
Too comprehensive	11.1	9.1	0	14.3	4.8	0
Not comprehensive enough	1.8	0	5.1	14.3	9.5	6.2
Relevant to student	26.4	27.3	2.5	6.7	4.8	29.4
Assignments appropriate in content	7.4	4.8	2.6	6.7	0	18.8
Assignments appropriate in length	7.4	23.8	12.5	50.0	2.3	5.9
Assignments interesting	16.7	18.2	2.5	0	0	5.9
Clear information about assignments, weights, and due dates	16.7	28.6	10.0	20.0	0	0

self = self-selected, non-self = non-self-selected
Only those questions to which at least 5% of the students responded negatively (as reported in Table 6) are reported in this table.
N varied from 54 to 87 for RLT 11, 46 to 61 for RLT 12, and 51 to 69 for RLT13.
In no cases were differences significant beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 1 d.f.

Table 15

PROBLEMS WITH HOME STUDY ENVIRONMENT BY TYPE OF STUDENT WITHIN EACH COURSE

Question	Percentage NEGATIVE Responses					
	RLT 11 (N=75)		RLT 12 (N=55)		RLT 13 (N=59)	
	self	non-self	self	non-self	self	non-self
Problems with home study environment	46.3	57.1	42.5	73.3*	45.2	76.5*

self = self-selected, non-self = non-self-selected
* Statistically significant beyond $p < .05$ using chi-square test with 1 d.f.

Table 16

REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT OF PROGRAM

Reason	Number of Students (%) (N=11) (*)
Course too difficult	2 (18%)
Material irrelevant	1 (9%)
No employer support	2 (18%)
Conflicts with work or family	6 (55%)
Medical/personal problems, death in family	3 (27%)
Moving out of province	1 (9%)
Does not work in library	1 (9%)
Not enough time	1 (9%)
Missed registration deadline	1 (9%)

* Percentages do not add up to 100 since students checked more than one response.

Table 17

EDUCATIONAL PLANS OF DROPOUTS

Question	Number of Students (%) (N=10)
Will take RLT courses again	8 (80%)
Will not take RLT courses again	2 (20%)
Are taking other library courses	1 (10%)
Are not taking other library courses	9 (90%)

APPENDIX B
STUDENT ASSESSMENT FORM

Name _____

Course title _____ Date: _____

Instructor/Tutor Name _____

Delivery Method:

Correspondence [ ] Teleconference [ ] On-site instructor [ ]

It is difficult to rate a course separately from its delivery system and its instructor. However, we have divided this form into three parts in order to better identify areas that are effective and those areas that need improvement. Hence we ask you to try to analyse each of these components: the course materials themselves, the method through which you were taught, and the qualities of the instructor or tutor.

COURSE MATERIALS

1. Overall, how would you rate the course materials?

Very good	Good	O.K.	Not very good	Terrible
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

2. In terms of understandability, how would you rate the written materials?

Very good	Good	O.K.	Not very good	Terrible
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

3. How would you rate the quality of the printing?

Very good [ ] Good [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very good [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

4. Did you receive the materials on time?

Yes [ ] No [ ]
Arrived on time, but would have preferred getting them earlier [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

5. How well were the purpose and content of the course explained?

Very well [ ] Well [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very well [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

6. Was the material presented in a logical step-by-step sequence?

Very logical [ ] Logical [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very logical [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

7. How up-to-date was the material?

Very up-to-date [ ] Up-to-date [ ] Not very up-to-date [ ] Really old stuff [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

8. How comprehensive was the material?

Too comprehensive [ ] About right [ ] Not comprehensive enough [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

9. How relevant was the course for you?

Very Relevant [ ] Relevant [ ] Not very relevant [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

10. In terms of content, how appropriate were the assignments?

Very appropriate [ ] Appropriate [ ] Not very appropriate [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

11. In terms of length, how appropriate were the assignments?

Very appropriate [ ] Appropriate [ ] Not very appropriate [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

12. How interesting were the assignments?

Very interesting [ ] Interesting [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very interesting [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

13. How clearly were you informed of subject assignments, weights, and due dates?

Very clearly [ ] Clearly [ ] Not very clearly [ ] Did not know at all [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

14. If audio-visual materials were used, how would you rate their quality?

Not used [ ] Very good [ ] Good [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very good [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

15. How accessible was necessary audio-visual equipment?

Not used [ ] Very accessible [ ] Accessible [ ] Not very accessible [ ] Not accessible at all [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

16. How well did the tests measure your achievement?

Very well [ ] Well [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very well [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

17. If a text book was used, how would you rate it for effectiveness and applicability? Not used [ ]

Very good [ ] Good [ ] O.K. [ ] Not very good [ ] Terrible [ ]

Comments: _____

_____

DELIVERY METHOD

1. Were there any difficulties with equipment (telephone lines, bridge lines, convenor, a.v. equipment)?

   Many problems [ ] Some problems [ ] Few Problems [ ] No Problems [ ]

   Comments: _____

   _____

2. Was use of the postal system a problem?

   Always [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

   Comments: _____

   _____

3. Were there problems in your traveling to the necessary location?

   Always [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

   Comments: _____

   _____

4. Were there problems with the time of the class, or the timing of phone calls from the tutor?

   Always [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

   Comments: _____

   _____

5. Were there problems with the classroom itself?

Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

6. Were there problems with trying to create a study environment at home?

Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

INSTRUCTOR/TUTOR

1. How would you assess the instructor/tutor's knowledge of the subject?

Very knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Not very knowledgeable	Hasn't a clue
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

2. How would you assess the instructor/tutor with respect to his preparation for the class or discussion session?

Well prepared	Adequately prepared	Not prepared enough	Not prepared at all
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

3. How would you assess the instructor/tutor's availability to help students at unscheduled times?

Most willing to help	Offers Adequate help	Does not seem willing	Is difficult to reach	Could never be reached
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

4. How would you rate the promptness with which your assignments and tests were marked and returned?

Very prompt	Prompt	Usually late	Always late
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

5. How would you rate the instructor/tutor's ability to explain points?

Very Good	Good	O.K.	Not very Good	Terrible
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

6. How would you rate the instructor/tutor's ability to motivate you?

Very Good	Good	O.K.	Not very Good	Terrible
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments: _____

_____

7. What are the strong characteristics which this instructor/tutor possesses?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B: Student Assessment Form

8. In what areas could the instructor improve?

_____

_____

_____

What did you like best about the whole course?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ABOUT ANY AREA:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C
FORM FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT COMPLETE COURSES

RURAL LIBRARY TRAINING PROJECT

Although you have not completed the course in which you were enrolled, would you please take a few minutes to fill out the following form. It will help us evaluate the pilot project and also to improve the course materials and delivery.

1. Why did you not complete the course? (Please check all that apply)

I already have library training ..... [ ]
I would prefer to get a library technician diploma ... [ ]
No support from employer ..... [ ]
Too many conflicts with work and family obligations .. [ ]
Family problems (serious illness, death, etc.) ..... [ ]
Personal problems ..... [ ]
Course was too easy ..... [ ]
Course was too difficult ..... [ ]
Problem with instructor/tutor ..... [ ]
Problem with time of class ..... [ ]
I was taking it through teleconference and didn't like teleconference ..... [ ]
I was taking it through correspondence and didn't like correspondence ..... [ ]
I was taking it with an instructor and didn't like the classroom situation ..... [ ]
Other

_____

_____

Appendix C: Form For Those Who Do Not Complete Courses

2. Do you plan to enroll in the Rural Library Training Project Courses again?

No ..... [ ]
Am still enrolled in one course ..... [ ]
Will take this same course again ..... [ ]
Will take another course next term ..... [ ]
May take other courses later on ..... [ ]
Other

_____

_____

Please also fill out the enclosed course evaluation form. Thank you for your time. We really do appreciate it.

APPENDIX D
COST ANALYSIS SPREADSHEETS

Appendix D: Cost Analysis Spreadsheets

RLT 11 COST ANALYSIS
CORRESPONDENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student			
	fixed	tutor variable (2 tutors)	student variable	40 enrolled students	38 completed students	30 students 1 tutor	40 students 1 tutor	60 students 2 tutors	60 students 3 tutors
telephone			$609.04	$15.23	$16.03	$15.23	$15.23	$15.23	$15.23
postage/packing			$158.10	$3.95	$4.16	$3.95	$3.95	$3.95	$3.95
tutor/instructor			$920.00	$23.00	$24.21	$23.00	$23.00	$23.00	$23.00
materials			$280.00	$7.00	$7.37	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00
tutor photocopying				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
con ed administration			$120.00	$3.00	$3.16	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$58.00	$100.00	$80.00	$5.95	$6.26	$5.60	$4.70	$4.63	$5.47
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
total	$58.00	$100.00	$2,167.14	$58.13	$61.19	$57.78	$56.88	$56.81	$57.65

RLT 11 COST ANALYSIS
TELECONFERENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student		
	fixed	student variable	site variable (6 sites)	20 enrolled students	20 completed students	20 students 6 sites	30 students 9 sites	60 students 18 sites
telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
postage/packing		$69.60		$3.48	$3.48	$3.48	$3.48	$3.48
tutor/instructor	$99.00	$150.00		$12.45	$12.45	$12.45	$10.80	$9.15
materials		$140.00		$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00
tutor photocopying				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
con ed administration		$30.00	$30.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$108.00	$40.00		$7.40	$7.40	$7.40	$5.60	$3.80
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator	$150.00			$7.50	$7.50	$7.50	$5.00	$2.50
teleconference sites			$288.00	$14.40	$14.40	$14.40	$14.40	$14.40
total	$357.00	$429.60	$318.00	$55.23	$55.23	$55.23	$49.28	$43.33

Appendix D: Cost Analysis Spreadsheets

RLT 11 COST ANALYSIS
ON-SITE

Cost Factors			Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student	
	fixed	variable	31 enrolled students	31 completed students	20 students	30 students
telephone		$33.40	$1.08	$1.08	$1.08	$1.08
postage/packing		$63.37	$2.04	$2.04	$2.04	$2.04
tutor/instructor	$99.00	$265.50	$11.76	$11.76	$13.51	$11.86
materials		$237.00	$7.65	$7.65	$7.65	$7.65
tutor photocopying		$12.90	$0.42	$0.42	$0.42	$0.42
con ed administration		$93.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$118.00	$62.00	$5.81	$5.81	$7.90	$5.93
travel	$202.40		$6.53	$6.53	$10.12	$6.75
supervisor telephone	$216.03		$6.97	$6.97	$10.80	$7.20
bridge/operator			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
total	$635.43	$767.17	$45.24	$45.24	$56.52	$45.93

RLT 12 COST ANALYSIS
CORRESPONDENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student			
	fixed	tutor variable (2 tutors)	student variable	32 enrolled students	29 completed students	30 students 1 tutor	40 students 1 tutor	60 students 2 tutors	60 students 3 tutors
telephone			$550.69	$17.21	$18.99	$17.21	$17.21	$17.21	$17.21
postage/packing			$123.05	$3.84	$4.24	$3.84	$3.84	$3.84	$3.84
tutor/instructor			$1,472.00	$46.00	$50.76	$46.00	$46.00	$46.00	$46.00
materials			$320.00	$10.00	$11.03	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying			$10.50	$0.33	$0.36	$0.33	$0.33	$0.33	$0.33
con ed administration			$96.00	$3.00	$3.31	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$75.00	$150.00	$64.00	$9.03	$9.97	$7.00	$5.75	$5.75	$7.00
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
total	$75.00	$150.00	$2,636.24	$89.41	$98.66	$87.38	$86.13	$86.13	$87.38

RLT 12 COST ANALYSIS
TELECONFERENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student		
	fixed	student variable	site variable (6 sites)	15 enrolled students	14 completed students	20 students 6 sites	30 students 9 sites	60 students 18 sites
telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
postage/packing		$60.60		$4.04	$4.33	$4.04	$4.04	$4.04
tutor/instructor	$198.00	$212.00		$27.33	$29.29	$24.03	$20.73	$17.43
materials		$150.00		$10.00	$10.71	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
con ed administration		$22.50	$22.50	$3.00	$3.21	$2.63	$2.63	$2.63
rlt administration	$150.00	$30.00		$12.00	$12.86	$9.50	$7.00	$4.50
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator	$300.00			$20.00	$21.43	$15.00	$10.00	$5.00
teleconference sites			$576.00	$38.40	$41.14	$28.80	$28.80	$28.80
total	$648.00	$475.10	$598.50	$114.77	$122.97	$94.00	$83.20	$72.40

8.1

8.3

RLT 12 COST ANALYSIS
ON-SITE

Cost Factors			Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student	
	fixed	variable	26 enrolled students	23 completed students	20 students	30 students
telephone		$78.86	$3.03	$3.43	$3.03	$3.03
postage/packing		$94.89	$3.65	$4.13	$3.65	$3.65
tutor/instructor	$198.00	$423.00	$23.88	$27.00	$26.17	$22.87
materials		$260.00	$10.00	$11.30	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying		$2.30	$0.09	$0.10	$0.09	$0.09
con ed administration		$78.00	$3.00	$3.39	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$150.00	$52.00	$7.77	$8.78	$9.50	$7.00
travel	$354.20		$13.62	$15.40	$17.71	$11.81
supervisor telephone	$244.02		$9.39	$10.61	$12.20	$8.13
bridge/operator			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
total	$946.22	$989.05	$74.43	$84.14	$85.35	$69.58

RLT 13 COST ANALYSIS
CORRESPONDENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student			
	fixed	tutor variable (2 tutors)	student variable	31 enrolled students	30 completed students	30 students 1 tutor	40 students 1 tutor	60 students 2 tutors	60 students 3 tutors
telephone			$655.41	$21.14	$21.85	$21.14	$21.14	$21.14	$21.14
postage/packing			$123.00	$3.97	$4.10	$3.97	$3.97	$3.97	$3.97
tutor/instructor			$1,426.00	$46.00	$47.53	$46.00	$46.00	$46.00	$46.00
materials			$310.00	$10.00	$10.33	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
con ed administration			$93.00	$3.00	$3.10	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$75.00	$150.00	$62.00	$9.26	$9.57	$7.00	$5.75	$5.75	$7.00
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
total	$75.00	$150.00	$2,669.41	$93.37	$96.48	$91.11	$89.86	$89.86	$91.11

RLT 13 COST ANALYSIS
TELECONFERENCE

Cost Factors				Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student		
	fixed	student variable	site variable (6 sites)	20 enrolled students	18 completed students	20 students 6 sites	30 students 9 sites	60 students 18 sites
telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
postage/packing		$74.00		$3.70	$4.11	$3.70	$3.70	$3.70
tutor/instructor	$198.00	$300.00		$24.90	$27.67	$24.90	$21.60	$18.30
materials		$200.00		$10.00	$11.11	$10.00	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
con ed administration		$30.00	$30.00	$3.00	$3.33	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$150.00	$40.00		$9.50	$10.56	$9.50	$7.00	$4.50
travel				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
supervisor telephone				$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
bridge/operator	$300.00			$15.00	$16.67	$15.00	$10.00	$5.00
teleconference sites			$576.00	$28.80	$32.00	$28.80	$28.80	$28.80
total	$648.00	$644.00	$606.00	$94.90	$105.45	$94.90	$84.10	$73.30

Appendix D: Cost Analysis Spreadsheets

RLT 13 COST ANALYSIS
ON-SITE

Cost Factors			Actual Cost Per Student		Projected Costs Per Student	
	fixed	variable	30 enrolled students	28 completed students	20 students	30 students
telephone		$68.23	$2.27	$2.44	$2.27	$2.27
postage/packing		$111.96	$3.73	$4.00	$3.73	$3.73
tutor/instructor	$198.00	$498.00	$23.20	$24.86	$26.50	$23.20
materials		$300.00	$10.00	$10.71	$10.00	$10.00
tutor photocopying		$2.58	$0.09	$0.09	$0.09	$0.09
con ed administration		$90.00	$3.00	$3.21	$3.00	$3.00
rlt administration	$150.00	$60.00	$7.00	$7.50	$9.50	$7.00
travel	$253.00		$8.43	$9.04	$12.65	$8.43
supervisor telephone	$164.51		$5.48	$5.88	$8.23	$5.48
bridge/operator			$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
teleconference sites	$111.76		$3.72	$3.99	$5.59	$3.72
total	$877.27	$1,130.77	$66.93	$71.71	$81.56	$66.93

APPENDIX E
COURSE DELIVERY PLAN

Basic premise: Students should be able to complete requirements for a basic level certificate in two years (four semesters).

Seventeen courses to rotate (at least for teleconference) on a six semester cycle, with prerequisite required course RLT 9/10 offered every semester, prerequisite collection development course RLT 23 offered every second semester, and required courses RLT 13 and 14 offered every third semester.

To be decided: whether to offer all courses in correspondence mode in every semester, some combination of courses, or only those teleconferenced.

On-site instructor delivery: to be negotiated with sponsoring body.

Semester 1:	RLT 9/10 and 23 alternate weeks RLT 13 and 14 alternate weeks	(begins Fall 1986 for non-pilot students)
Semester 2:	RLT 9/10 and 28 alternate weeks RLT 24 and 32 alternate weeks	
Semester 3:	RLT 9/10 and 23 alternate weeks RLT 22 and 29 alternate weeks	
Semester 4:	RLT 9/10 and 25 alternate weeks RLT 13 and 14 alternate weeks	
Semester 5:	RLT 9/10 and 23 alternate weeks RLT 27 and 33 alternate weeks	
Semester 6:	RLT 9/10 and 21 alternate weeks RLT 26 and 31 alternate weeks	

APPENDIX F
REVISED CURRICULUM

This document represents the revised curriculum for the Rural Library Training Project as of the date below. This curriculum most likely will continue to be revised as the project progresses through its course development and field test phases. This curriculum leads to a two level certificate in Small Library Operations.

The overall intent of the project is to provide a basic level of training for those personnel who work in small rural public and school libraries but who have minimal or no formal training in library practices.

March 1986

Appendix F: Revised Curriculum

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF RLT CURRICULUM

These objectives are divided into two parts to reflect the differing roles that library staff in public and library staff in school libraries play.

OBJECTIVES FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY STAFF

At the end of the complete Rural Library Training Program, the student will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of library terminology by using the terminology correctly in written and spoken communication,

2. Demonstrate an understanding of library procedures by:

   a) describing and applying standard library procedures (circulation, acquisitions, organization)

   b) describing their basic purposes and uses

   c) implementing or developing plans for implementing efficient (*) library procedures in a library,

3. Develop in cooperation with the Library Board:

   a) a collection development policy and a selection policy based on user needs, standard selection tools, and unique library situation (budget, space, etc.),

   b) a statement of library goals,

   c) short and long-range plans for development and maintenance of the library,

   d) a promotional plan including community relations and publicity,

   e) budget in keeping with the other policies and plans,

(*) Efficient = cost-effective, time-saving, simple, avoiding loss or waste of energy, adaptable to change.

f) other policies in keeping with the requirements of the **Libraries Act** and **Libraries Regulation** in regard to personnel, continuing education, resource sharing, provision of special materials in languages other than English and materials for the handicapped,

4. Maintain the library in an efficient business-like manner with library records and files effectively organized for easy retrieval of needed data,

5. Select and maintain a basic collection of print, non-print and periodical materials suitable for the clientele and based on the selection and collection development policies,

6. Select and maintain a basic current reference collection,

7. Demonstrate efficient use of the total collection and of outside resources as appropriate for quick and in-depth reference requests,

8. Promote the library to the community by maintaining a high profile, implementing a marketing plan, and fostering an attractive and welcoming environment,

9. Deal efficiently and cooperatively with the Library Board,

10. Establish and maintain programs for children, young adults, adults and other special interest groups,

11. Recommend suitable materials to patrons,

12. Provide access to materials not in the on-site library collection through appropriate choice of interlibrary loan, acquisition, informal borrowing, use of multilingual, talking book, large print book collections,

13. Select, use, and maintain necessary audio-visual equipment for use of the non-print collection,

14. Develop a plan for use of microcomputers as appropriate for library operations.

OBJECTIVES FOR SCHOOL LIBRARY STAFF

At the end of the complete Rural Library Training Program, the student will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of library terminology by using the terminology correctly in written and spoken communication,

2. Demonstrate an understanding of library procedures by:

   a) describing and applying standard library procedures (circulation, acquisitions, organization)

   b) describing their basic purposes and uses

   c) implementing or developing plans for implementing efficient (*) library procedures in a library,

3. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the development of:

   a) a collection development policy and a selection policy based on user needs, standard selection tools, and unique library situation (budget, space, etc.),

   b) a statement of library goals,

   c) short and long-range plans for development and maintenance of the library,

   d) a promotional plan including community relations and publicity,

   e) budget in keeping with the other policies and plans,

4. Maintain the library in an efficient business-like manner with library records and files effectively organized for easy retrieval of needed data,

5. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the selection and maintenance of a basic collection of print, non-print and periodical materials suitable for the clientele and based on the selection and collection development policies,

6. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers,

---

(*) Efficient = cost-effective, time-saving, simple, avoiding loss or waste of energy, adaptable to change.

teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the selection and maintenance of a basic current reference collection,

7. Demonstrate efficient use of the total collection and of outside resources as appropriate for quick and in-depth reference requests,

8. Promote the library to the community by maintaining a high profile, implementing a marketing plan, and fostering an attractive and welcoming environment,

9. Deal efficiently and cooperatively with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators,

10. Work with teachers to establish and maintain programs for children, young adults, adults and other special interest groups,

11. Recommend suitable materials to patrons,

12. Provide access to materials not in the on-site library collection through appropriate choice of interlibrary loan, acquisition, informal borrowing, use of multilingual, talking book, large print book collections,

13. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the selection of audio-visual equipment for use of the non-print collection,

14. Use and maintain necessary audio-visual equipment for use of the non-print collection,

15. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the development of a plan for use of microcomputers as appropriate for library operations.

16. Demonstrate an understanding of and cooperate with teachers, teacher-librarians, and school administrators in the development of other policies in keeping with the requirements of **Policy, Guidelines, Procedures and Standards for School Libraries in Alberta**, including plans for support to teachers, teacher/librarians, and principals in integrating the library program with the instructional program of the school.

REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATE IN SMALL LIBRARY OPERATIONS

	SMALL LIBRARY OPERATIONS
Requirements BASIC LEVEL ADVANCED LEVEL	 18 IUs (*) 26 IUs
Mandatory Courses:	RLT 10 (2 IUs) or RLT 9 combined with LIT 120 (2 IUs) RLT 13 (2 IUs) RLT 14 (2 IUs)
Elective Courses (**) BASIC LEVEL	 12 IUs chosen from: RLT courses: RLT 21-39 (2 IUs each) SAIT courses: LIT 123, LIT 124, LIT 221, LIT 224, LIT 232, LIT 527, ENGL 121, ENGL 122 (3 IUs each) GMCC courses: LT 105.3, LT 205.3 (3 IUs each)
Elective Courses (**) ADVANCED LEVEL	 8 additional IUs chosen from: RLT courses: RLT 21-39 (2 IUs each) SAIT courses: LIT 123, LIT 124, LIT 221, LIT 224, LIT 232, LIT 527, ENGL 121, ENGL 122 (3 IUs each) GMCC courses: LT 105.3, LT 205.3 (3 IUs each)

(*) One instructional unit is approximately equivalent to a twelve lecture hour academic class.

(**) Credit will not be granted for both an RLT course and its SAIT/GMCC analog. Credit may also be granted for SAIT or GMCC courses not in this list.

SCOPE OF INDIVIDUAL RLT COURSES

RLT 9/10 Introduction to Library Training

RLT 9/10 describes the purpose and format of the Rural Library Training Project, the use of the course materials, and the basic study skills that are needed to successfully use RLT materials and to write RLT exams. RLT 10 also describes basic library terminology, materials, and the interrelationships of circulation, acquisitions, and organizational procedures.

Students who already have credit for SAIT's LIT 120 will enroll in RLT 9. Students who have not taken SAIT's LIT 120 will enroll in RLT 10. Either RLT 10 or RLT 9 combined with SAIT's LIT 120 is a prerequisite for all other RLT courses.

RLT 13 Basic Library Management

Setting library goals; identifying procedures for presenting reports especially annual reports; developing a budget; maintenance of necessary office files; appropriate legislation; dealing with Library Boards, Trustees, and with School Administrators and Teachers.

RLT 14 Information Services

Selecting a basic reference collection and developing a search strategy for using that collection; the types of reference service and questions; identification of outside resources; effective reference interview techniques.

RLT 21 Communications Skills

Bibliographic entries; correct writing skills; basic formats used in business and technical writing; public speaking skills.

RLT 22 Library Marketing

An introduction to the basic principles of promoting libraries to their clientele and to the public, including appropriate marketing strategies for both public and school libraries.

RLT 23 Basic Collection Development and Reader Guidance

Needs analysis; collection assessment; development of selection and collection development policies; deselection; basic selection tools; selecting and maintaining a basic collection.

This is a prerequisite for RLT 24, RLT 25, and RLT 26.

RLT 24 Collection Development, Reader Guidance, and Programming for Children

Selection and evaluation of fiction and nonfiction materials for children, including non-book materials; programming and library service to children.

RLT 25 Collection Development, Reader Guidance, and Programming for Young Adults

Selection and evaluation of fiction and nonfiction materials for young adults, including non-book materials; awareness of current trends and issues involving young adult materials; programming and library service to young adults.

RLT 26 Collection Development, Reader Guidance, and Programming for Adults and Special Groups

Selection and evaluation of fiction and nonfiction materials for adults and special groups, including non-book materials; awareness of current trends and issues involving adult materials; programming and library service to adults and special groups.

RLT 27 Acquisitions and Serials

Overview of acquisition procedures; introduction to selection and basic bibliographic tools; ordering and use of jobbers; records and files; order preparation and receiving activities; accounting procedures; serial ordering and control.

RLT 28 Collection Organization and Filing

Basic elements of descriptive cataloging; arrangement and use of Dewey Decimal Classification system and Sears Subject Headings; use of CIP data; use and maintenance of a shelf list; use of ALA Filing Rules (1980).

RLT 29 Circulation

Introduction to circulation systems including charging, discharging, interlibrary loan, reserves and holds; advantages and disadvantages of microbased circulation systems.

RLT 31 Non-print: Equipment and Software

Selection, operation, and simple maintenance of common audio-visual equipment; selection of software, organization, circulation, and maintenance of software; simple production techniques.

RLT 32 Microcomputer Applications for Small Libraries

Selection of microcomputer hardware and software; uses of microcomputers for library operations; development of a long-range plan for acquisition and use of microcomputers in a small library.

RLT 33 Special Services

Needs of special groups (handicapped, multilingual, etc.) as they relate to the library; physical accessability of the library; shut-in service.

RLT 39 Professional Development

Developing pre-conference or pre-workshop objectives; use of reporting techniques as follow-up to workshops/conferences; relationship of the workshop/conference to the individual library situation.

SCOPE OF SAIT/GMCC COURSES AVAILABLE THROUGH DISTANCE EDUCATION

ENGL 121 Writing Fundamentals 36 Hours

Review of the mechanics of writing; study of the basic language terms and prose styles; study and practice in the writing of prose.

ENGL 122 Introductory Report Writing 36 Hours

Prerequisite: ENGL 121

Covers various short form reports, including recommendation, progress and periodic. Includes basic patterns of expository writing and the selection, arrangement and presentation of data in a variety of formats, including letters and memos.

LIT 120 Introduction to Libraries 24 Hours

Purpose and scope of library service; basic library skills and library terminology; overview of library organization and personnel. This course is a prerequisite for all subsequent library skills courses in the curriculum.

LIT 123 Acquisitions 60 Hours

Overview of acquisition procedures; introduction to selection and bibliographic tools; bibliographical searching, verifying and ordering; records and files; order preparation and receiving activities.

LIT 124 Arrangement of Materials I 60 Hours

Introduction to descriptive and entry heading cataloging for print materials; **ALA Filing Rules** (1980).

LIT 221 Circulation Systems 36 Hours

Introduction to circulation systems including charging, discharging, reserves and holds.

LIT 224 Arrangement of Materials II 60 Hours

Prerequisite: LIT 124.

Assignment of Dewey decimal classification numbers and subject headings to print materials; construction of call numbers; uses of the shelf list; construction of headings for corporate bodies and complex personal names; typing of catalog cards.

LIT 232 Library Marketing 36 Hours

An introduction to the basic principles of promoting libraries to their clientele and to the public (including public, school, academic and special libraries).

LIT 527 Children's Materials 48 Hours

Selection and evaluation of fiction and nonfiction materials for children; library service to children.

LT 105.3 Technical Processing I 60 Hours

This course examines the procedures for the selection, verification, ordering and processing of various types of library materials, and the maintenance of the various files necessary for these procedures.

LT 205.3 Technical Processing II 60 Hours

This course introduces the principles and practice of descriptive cataloging for all types of library materials as prescribed by the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Also included are the procedures involved in the organization of authority files, the strategies utilized in searching for cataloging information and the maintenance of catalogues.

APPENDIX G
PROJECTED STATUS OF COURSES, AUGUST 1986

Appendix G: Projected Status of Courses, August 1986

	Phase Two/Three			Phase Four		
RLT course	developed	field tested	revised	developed	field tested	revised
RLT 9/10 Introduction to Library Training	Summer 85*	Fall 85*	Spring 86			
RLT 13 Basic Management	Summer 85	Fall 85	Spring 86			
RLT 14 Info. Services	Fall 86	Winter 86	Spring 86			
RLT 21 Communication	Spring 86				Winter 87	Spring 87
RLT 22 Marketing	Spring 86				Winter 87	Spring 87
RLT 23 Collect. Devel.	Winter 86	Winter 86	Spring 86			
RLT 24 Children's Services	Spring 86				Fall 86	Spring 87
RLT 25 Young Adult Serv.	Spring 86				Fall 86	Spring 87
RLT 26 Adult Services				Fall 86	Winter 87	Spring 87
RLT 27 Acquisitions	Spring 86				Winter 87	Spring 87
RLT 28 Collect. Organiz.	Winter 86				Fall 86	Spring 87
RLT 29 Circulation	Spring 86				Fall 86	Winter 87
RLT 31 Non-print	Spring 86				Fall 86	Winter 87
RLT 32 Microcomputers	Winter 86	Spring 86				Fall 86
RLT 33 Special Services				Fall 86	Winter 87	Spring 87
RLT 39 Prof. Dev.	Fall 85	Fall/ Winter 86	Spring 86			

* Originally developed and field tested as RLT 11 and RL 12

APPENDIX H
SUPPORT FOR PHASE FOUR

The evidence to support the need for Phase Four of the Rural Library Training Project can be summarized as:

1. Phase One survey data
2. Pilot student enthusiasm
3. Requests to participate
4. Extraprovincial interest
5. Stakeholder group support
6. Achievement of learning objectives

The **Phase One survey data** indicate a definite need and market for this kind of a training project. A 60% return rate on a twelve page questionnaire with 95% of these responses favorable and enthusiastic indicates that there are a great many people in the province with training needs. In addition to the survey, written comments and letters accompanying these questionnaires reinforced the evidence of need.

Pilot student enthusiasm is evidenced by the high response rate in enrollment. One hundred fifty invitations to participate in the pilot project were sent and ninety-three students registered for the first courses. In addition, a low drop-out rate of 6% indicates that the

students are satisfied with the courses. Verbal and written comments from the students as well as the course evaluations completed by each student for each course indicate satisfaction and enthusiasm for the project.

Requests to participate in the courses arrive continually from individuals and representatives of systems outside the pilot area. Some of these are from rural librarians who initiate the request for enrollment on their own; others are from the regional library systems in Alberta, from school systems, and from library boards. These requests are due in part to the awareness of the project generated by the initial needs analysis, as well as by the general publicity distributed throughout the province both formally and through informal word-of-mouth contacts.

Extraprovincial interest has also been supportive. The Pacific Northwest Library Association, New Brunswick Library Services, Manitoba Public Library Services, Union of Ontario Indians, and Ontario Library Services have been following the development of the project and the curriculum. They have expressed their interest in the course development and in potential delivery arrangements. Individuals in the Northwest Territories, the Yukon, and northern Saskatchewan have also been requesting information about participation in the RLT courses. This extraterritorial interest in the project represents the potential to expand the market base for the curriculum and allow for greater cost-effectiveness, as well as support Alberta's involvement in cooperative interprovincial distance education.

Stakeholder group support has been very positive. The Library Association of Alberta, the Regional Library Systems, the Alberta Association of Library Technicians, the advisory councils for the Library Technician Programs at SAIT and GMCC, and the Alberta Library Trustees Association, and Alberta Library Board have all expressed their support for continutation of the project. Representatives from Alberta Education and Alberta Culture are actively involved in curriculum development.

Achievement of learning objectives in the Fall field test courses has been extensively discussed in this report.

A COOPERATIVE PROJECT

for the

DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF TRAINING

to

RURAL LIBRARY STAFF ACROSS ALBERTA

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF PHASE TWO/THREE

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

Submitted to:
Program Planning and Development Branch
Alberta Advanced Education

Submitted by:
Allen Ponak, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Faculty of Management
University of Calgary

April 1986

RURAL LIBRARY TRAINING PROJECT
EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF PHASE TWO/THREE
SECOND INTERIM REPORT

The following evaluation is based on meetings and discussions with the Project Coordinator and Program Supervisor, scrutiny of the research instruments and the statistical procedures, and a review of the **Phase Two/Three Second Interim Report.**

Objectives. Satisfactory progress is being achieved with respect to the objectives for Phases Two and Phase Three of the Project. The assessment by the Project Management Team regarding progress to date on each of the objectives (as detailed on pages two through four of the report) is, my opinion, an accurate assessment of the status of these objectives. I concur fully with the assessment.

Methodology. I continue to have a high degree of confidence in the appropriateness and the quality of the research instruments and statistical procedures. As Phases Two/Three progress, evidence mounts

regarding the soundness of the various questionnaires and testing instruments developed for the Project. Procedures for coding and transferring the questionnaire data to computer files have been thoroughly tested and found to be satisfactory. Accordingly, a viable student information database has been created and is expanding as more courses are offered. This information system can accommodate additional students and courses.

The statistical procedures employed (particularly chi-square) are appropriate for the type of analysis being conducted. Use of the .05 confidence interval for tests of statistical significance is justified. Overall, the instruments and statistical analysis conform to accepted methodological standards and are appropriate to the nature of the research and evaluative questions posed by the Project.

Cost Analysis. Methods developed to generate cost data for RLT 11, RLT 12, and RLT 13 appear reasonable and provide satisfactory cost information. Costs were divided into two categories: fixed and variable. Appropriately, certain development costs were excluded from the calculations. Extrapolations were made to control for different course enrollments enabling useful computations to be made. The framework utilized can be extended to future courses. Based on the information to date, conclusions drawn regarding costs across delivery modes appear justified and the decision to raise tuition is appropriate (assuming cost-recovery is a desirable institutional goal).

In summary, I continue to have nothing but praise for the Project Management Team, especially Project Coordinator Marilyn Ming and Program Supervisor Gary W. MacDonald. They display good grasp of the day-to-day mechanics of running the Project and excellent orientation toward evaluation and future planning. The level of energy noted in earlier reports has been maintained. In addition, a more comprehensive involvement with the statistical procedures, statistical analysis, and database design has been undertaken. Overall, the Project is on-track and I have every reason to believe that it will so remain.